

Letters to the Editor

To the Editor:

As a doctoral candidate in political science about to enter the ever-narrowing job market, I more than anyone am keenly aware of the need for broadening the ways in which political scientists might effectively use their skills and knowledge. However, I am increasingly disturbed, even appalled, at the growing acceptance and promotion of political risk analysis as a viable alternative for political scientists.

Professor LaPalombara's *PS* article (Spring, '82), "Assessing the Political Environment for Business: A New Role for Political Scientists?" concludes by saying, "Far from suggesting a return to the kind of bare-facts, routing-the-mail approach to the governmental process we have long since abandoned for more rarified theoretical constructions, we should now be more concerned with taking these constructions back to earth—which is where corporate decision-makers are located. If we can make even a modest step in this direction, we will be able to help banks and corporations make better assessments not only of risk but also of opportunities. It is a heady challenge. If nothing else, the prospects for our graduates in the academic marketplace suggest that we explore it without prejudice or preconception."

There is, it seems to me, a basic contradiction in pursuing a line of training "without prejudice or preconception" which ultimately might be highly prejudicial to the citizens of the country being analyzed. Where is the objectivity that political scientists once professed to be so vital to their discipline?

Elizabeth Leeds
Doctoral Candidate
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

To the Editor:

For several years, I have served on the National Science Foundation Graduate Fellowship Evaluation Committee for the Social and Behavioral Sciences. This particular panel evaluates graduate fellowship applicants in economics, history of science, geography and political science. It is disappointing to note that, generally, few qualified political science students apply for this highly valued award. Given the present economic constraints, and this is likely to continue for some time, we need to encourage our outstanding graduating seniors to apply for these fellowships.

The NSF graduate awards are tenable for three years in any accredited graduate program. Currently, a recipient receives an annual stipend of \$6,900 and the institution receives approximately \$4,000 in lieu of tuition, where such charges are levied.

According to the NSF:

"NSF Graduate Fellowships are limited to individuals who are citizens or nationals of the United States at the time of application. Eligibility is further limited to those individuals who, at the time of application, have not completed more than 20 semester/30 quarter hours, or equivalent, of study in any of the science and engineering fields listed above following completion of their first baccalaureate degree in science or engineering. This guideline is applied regardless of whether credit for those hours is available for study toward another degree. The last year of a joint baccalaureate-master's degree program, for this purpose, is considered to follow completion of the baccalaureate degree."

Letters

This is not an easy award to receive. However, I know that there are a lot of outstanding political science graduating seniors who have excellent chances of winning this award. Therefore, I would

like to see more qualified political science students apply.

Victor A. Olorunsola
Iowa State University

In the spring 1982 issue of *PS*, David Truman, E. E. Schattschneider, and Merle Fainsod were not identified as past APSA presidents in the article on "Reputations vs. Citations: Who Are the Top Scholars in Political Science?" Also in the spring *PS*, the listing for the Asian Political Studies Research Committee meeting in 1984 was incorrectly listed as Panjab, Korea. The correct meeting place is Panjab, *India*.